

**REMARKS**

The Office Action of December 13, 2007 was received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the currently pending rejections are requested for the reasons advanced in detail below.

Claims 1-32, 35, 39-41, 43-46, 49-52, 55-64 and 67-74 were pending prior to the instant amendment, of which claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 17, 20, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35 and 41 have been withdrawn. By this amendment, claims 1 and 2 are amended. New claim 75 has been added (see, for example, page 5, lines 11-12 of specification). No new matter has been introduced. Consequently, claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 11, 13-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 39, 40, 43-46, 49-52, 55-64 and 67-74 are currently pending for consideration in the instant application, of which claims 1, 2, 49, 50 and 69 are independent.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-5, 10-11, 21-22, 24-27, 39-40, 49-50, 57-62 and 67-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Pat. Pub. 2001/0004281 to Sasaki (Sasaki) in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0063842 to Gyoda (Gyoda) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,331,844 to Masazumi (Masazumi) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,476,899 to Ishida et al. (Ishida). Claims 7, 8 and 51-52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki in view of Gyoda in view of Masazumi in view of Ishida in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,226,067 to Nishiguchi et al. (Nishiguchi). Claims 13-14 and 55-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki in view of Gyoda in view of Masazumi in view of Ishida in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2003/0090609 to Inoue et al. (Inoue). Claims 15-16 and 18-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki in view of Gyoda in view of Masazumi in view of Ishida in view of Inoue and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,639,647 to Inou et al. (Inou). Claims 30-31 and 63-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki in view of

Gyoda in view of Masazumi in view of Ishida in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,773,737 to Yokono et al. (Yokono). Claims 43 and 45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki in view of Gyoda in view of Masazumi in view of Ishida and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0027636 to Yamada (Yamada). Claims 44 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki in view of Gyoda in view of Masazumi in view of Ishida and further in view of U.S. Pat. Pub. 2001/0052959 to Tamatani et al. (Tamatani). Claims 69 and 71-72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki in view of Gyoda in view of Masazumi and further in view of Ishida and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,796,458 to Koike (Koike). Claim 70 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki in view of Gyoda in view of Masazumi in view of Ishida in view of Koike in view of Nishiguchi. Claim 74 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki in view of Gyoda in view of Masazumi in view of Ishida in view of Koike in view of Inoue. Finally, claim 73 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Sasaki in view of Gyoda in view of Masazumi in view of Ishida in view of Koike in view of Yokono. These rejections are respectfully traversed at least for the reasons provided below.

With respect to independent claims 1, 2, 49 and 50, the Examiner asserts that Sasaki substantially discloses the claimed invention except for the claimed features of discharging a plurality of droplets by ink-jet under reduced pressure; discharging the sealed material by inkjet; and dropping the liquid crystals is discharged from a plurality of movable nozzles (see Office Action, page 3). The Examiner relies upon Gyoda for curing the deficiencies of Sasaki, since the Examiner asserts that Gyoda teaches discharge of a liquid crystal layer by inkjet in a vacuum that provides discharge with high accuracy (paragraph [0107] of Gyoda). Further, the Examiner relies upon Masazumi for curing the deficiencies of Sasaki, since the

Examiner asserts that Masazumi teaches discharges dropping from a plurality of movable nozzles (see col. 16, lines 30-67 of Masazumi). Also, the Examiner relies upon Ishida for curing the deficiencies of Sasaki, since the Examiner asserts that Ishida discloses discharging the sealing member by ink-jet. However, Applicants contend that Sasaki in view of Gyoda in view of Masazumi and further in view of Ishida, fails to render the claimed invention unpatentable. Each of the claims recite a specific combination of features that distinguishes the invention from the prior art in different ways. For example, independent claims 1 and 2 recite a combination that includes, among other things:

wherein the plurality of droplets containing the liquid crystal are discharged under reduced pressure by ink-jet from a plurality of nozzles which move.

Independent claims 49 and 50 recite yet another combination that includes, *inter alia*,

wherein the plurality of droplets containing the liquid crystal are discharged by ink-jet from a plurality of nozzles which move.

At the very least, the applied references, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest any of these exemplary features recited in independent claims 1, 2, 49 and 50. For instance, the Examiner asserts, as mentioned above, that Masazumi discloses these features in col. 16, lines 30-67. However, Applicants could not find these exemplary features in Masazumi. In fact, Applicants found instead that the base 5A moves and droplets of the liquid crystal materials 9a, 9a' and 9a'' are applied over the base 5A. Masazumi discloses a roll-to-roll method. Thus, Masazumi fails to disclose or suggest the feature of a plurality of nozzles which move, as presently claimed. In view of the above, Applicants contend that even when the cited references are combined, the present invention cannot be obtained.

Therefore, it cannot be said that Sasaki, taken in combination with Gyoda, Masazumi and Ishida, makes obvious the present invention, as claimed.

With respect to independent claim 69, the Examiner relies upon Koike for curing the deficiencies of Sasaki, since the Examiner asserts that Koike discloses a patterned alignment layer disposed via inkjet. However, claim 69 recites, *inter alia*, the features of “wherein the plurality of droplets containing the liquid crystal are discharged by ink-jet from a plurality of nozzles which move.” Therefore, a similar argument can be made with respect to independent claim 69 and Masazumi, as discussed above.

In accordance with the M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1970). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that neither Sasaki, Gyoda, Masazumi, Ishida and/or Koike, taken alone or in any proper combination, discloses or suggests the subject matter as recited in claims 1, 2, 49, 50 and 69. Hence, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Nishiguchi, Inoue, Inou, Yokono, Yamada and Tamatani fail to overcome the deficiencies mentioned above. Each of the dependent claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 2, 49, 50 or 69 and are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claims 1, 2, 49, 50 and 69.

In addition, each of the dependent claims also recite combinations that are separately patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this claimed invention, as amended, is not rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore

request the entry of this response, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In discussing the specification, claims, and drawings in this response, it is to be understood that Applicants in no way intend to limit the scope of the claims to any exemplary embodiments described in the specification and/or shown in the drawings. Rather, Applicants are entitled to have the claims interpreted broadly, to the maximum extent permitted by statute, regulation, and applicable case law.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite issuance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigned agent at (202) 585-8100.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean A. Pryor, Reg. #48103/  
Sean A. Pryor

**NIXON PEABODY LLP**  
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204  
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900  
Washington, DC 20004  
Tel: 202-585-8000  
Fax: 202-585-8080